

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

RICKY D. JONES,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 22-cv-11972  
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

DEPARTMENT OF  
VETERAN AFFAIRS,

Defendant.

/

---

**ORDER (1) ADOPTING RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION OF REPORT  
AND RECOMMENDATION (ECF No. 43) AND (2) GRANTING  
DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF No. 33)**

In this action, Plaintiff Ricky D. Jones brings claims for discrimination and retaliation under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 against his former employer, the Department of Veteran Affairs (the “VA”). (*See* Compl., ECF No. 1.)

On September 11, 2023, the VA moved for summary judgment. (*See* Mot., ECF No. 33.) The motion was referred to the assigned Magistrate Judge, and on July 9, 2024, the Magistrate Judge recommended that the Court grant the motion (the “R&R”). (*See* R&R, ECF No. 43.) At the conclusion of the R&R, the Magistrate Judge informed the parties that if they wanted to seek review of his recommendation, they needed to file specific objections with the Court within fourteen days. (*See id.*, PageID.1366-1367.)

Jones has not filed any objections to the R&R. Nor has he contacted the Court to ask for additional time to file objections. The failure to object to an R&R releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). *See also Ivey v. Wilson*, 832 F.2d 950, (6th Cir. 1987) (explaining that where party fails to file “timely objections” to report and recommendation, court may accept that recommendation “without expressing any view on the merits of the magistrate’s conclusions”). Likewise, the failure to file objections to an R&R waives any further right to appeal. *See Howard v. Sec’y of Health and Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505 (6th Cir. 1991); *Smith v. Detroit Fed’n of Teachers Local 231*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987).

Accordingly, because Jones has not filed any objections to the R&R, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge’s recommended disposition of the VA’s motion is **ADOPTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the VA’s motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 33) is **GRANTED**. Jones’ claims are therefore **DISMISSED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Matthew F. Leitman

MATTHEW F. LEITMAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: July 31, 2024

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on July 31, 2024, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Ryan  
Case Manager  
(313) 234-5126